

REMARKS**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-8, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Roohparvar et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,561) in view of *Manning* (U.S. Patent No. 6,032,274). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1, 7, 12, 20, 21, and 23 have been amended to include limitations that describe the bit match circuits as having complementary transfer gates controlled by a logical combination of a predetermined bit and an enable signal. The allowable subject matter of claim 9 has been included into claim 7 and claim 9 canceled. Additionally, claims 2, 18, and 19 have been canceled without prejudice.

Roohparvar et al. disclose an output data compression scheme. The detection blocks 48, 50 detect patterns among the data bits of word sendat[15:0]. Figure 6 illustrates the logical composition of the detection blocks 48, 50 as logically ANDing the input data bits.

Applicant's invention, as claimed in the amended claims, is to a data compression apparatus and read methods that include bit match circuits comprising complementary transfer gates that are controlled by a predetermined bit and an enable signal. This structure is neither taught nor suggested by *Roohparvar et al.*

Additionally, Applicant's claims are to the matching of a predetermined bit of a plurality of words. *Roohparvar et al.* detect all of the bits of one word and neither teach nor suggest matching any one bit of a plurality of words.

Manning discloses a method and apparatus for compressed data testing. The apparatus of *Manning* uses a driver circuit 128 that is driven to a tri-state condition when banks 80a – 80h do not match the data written to a location. This neither teaches nor suggests Applicant's invention as claimed for complementary transfer gates that are controlled by a predetermined bit and an enable signal. *Manning* also neither teaches nor suggests performing the bit matching on a predetermined bit of a plurality of words as claimed by Applicant.

Therefore, even if it were obvious to combine *Manning* with *Roohparvar et al.*, and Applicant maintains that it is not, the combination would still not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter


Claims 9-11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The subject matter of claim 9 has been added into claim 7. Claim 9 has been canceled and claims 10 and 11 have been amended to depend from the amended claim 7.

Claims 14-17 and 22 were allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2211. No new matter has been entered and no additional fee required by this amendment and response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/21/06

Kenneth W. Bolvin
Reg. No. 34,125

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
T (612) 312-2200
F (612) 312-2250